

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 06 2005

**DILLON & YUDELL LLP**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

## FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner T. Truong	Antony P. Ng, Reg. No. 43,427
COMPANY:	DATE:
U. S. Patent and Trademark Office	December 6, 2005
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571.273.8300/Central No.	4
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	RP9-99-048
RE:	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:
Reply Brief	09/281,852

☐ URGENT ☒ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

## NOTES/COMMENTS:

Please see the attached formal response, and feel free to call me at (512) 343.6116 should you have any questions concerning the attached.

Respectfully submitted,  
Antony P. Ng/vf

This fax from the law firm of Dillon & Yudell LLP contains information that is confidential or privileged, or both. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named on this fax cover letter. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by any person other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us by telephone immediately at 512.343.6116 so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the transmitted documents at no cost to you.

8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110, AUSTIN, TEXAS 78759  
512.343.6116 (V) • 512.343.6446 (F) • DILLONYUDELL.COM

DEC 06 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Attorney Docket No. RP9-99-048

In re Application of:

CROMER ET AL.

Serial No. 09/281,852

Filed: 31 MARCH 1999

For: DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM  
AND METHOD FOR MAINTAINING  
SECURE DATA BLOCKS

Examiner: TRUONG, T.

Art Unit: 2135

REPLY BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 18, 2005.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE  
37 § CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date below.

12/6/05  
Date

Viktor Filizary  
Signature

### REMARKS

On page 7 of the Examiner's Answer, in response to the Appellants' point of the cited references do not teach or suggest a protected storage device for storing an encryption key pair and a non-protected storage device for storing encrypted cookies, the Examiner asserts that "all data exchanged between browser 100 and HTTP server 402 is encrypted." The Examiner also asserts that a browser is "not restricted, not secure, and unsafe area," that "Shrader teaches other encryption techniques, such as a private key cryptosystem using a session key ..., the key pair is constructed and stored locally...", and that "Win and Shrader, in combination, teach the claimed subject matter."

Assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's above-mentioned assertions are correct, the Examiner still has not pointed out where in *Win* and/or *Shrader* that teaches the claimed steps of "in response to the receipt of a cookie generated by an application from a remote server, encrypting said cookie with said public key" and "storing said encrypted cookie in a non-protected storage device within said data processing system." In addition, *Shrader* may have taught various encryption techniques, but *Shrader* does not teach or suggest the claimed step of "storing a encryption key pair having a private key and a public key in a protected storage device within said data processing system."

On page 9 of the Examiner's Answer, in response to the Appellants' point of the cited references do not teach or suggest a hard drive for storing encrypted cookies, the Examiner asserts that Claim 2 does not reflect the Appellants' arguments, and that "Win teaches when a user quits the browser 100, cookies that have not expired are saved on a mass storage device associated with the browser 100, such as a disk drive... (column 11, lines 14-18 of Win)"

Claim 1 recites a step of "storing said encrypted cookie in a non-protected storage device within said data processing system," and Claim 2, which depends on Claim 1, recites "said non-protected storage device is a hard drive." Thus, Claim 2 supports the Appellant's point of the claimed invention provides "a hard drive for storing encrypted cookies." In addition, even

with the above-cited passage, the Examiner still has not provided any reference from *Win* that teaches the cookies being saved on a disk drive are encrypted. Also, col. 11, lines 14-18 of *Win* states that "Administrators may also defined the time after which a user is prompted to changed the user's passage. This period can be set system wide or for each individual user. The system ensures that passwords are not reused," and such teachings are different from what the Examiner has cited.

For the reasons stated above, Appellants believe the § 103 rejection for Claims 1-7 and 10-16 is improper and should be reversed.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event an additional fee or extension of time is required, please charge that fee or extension of time requested to the Lenovo Deposit Account 50-3533.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng  
Registration No. 43,427  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS